_____

"What can be described can happen too…": on the imaginary conversation between the poet and the tsar[1]

Suren Zolyan
Institute of Philosophy, Nat. Academy of Sciences, Yerevan, Armenia
Institute of Humanities, Im. Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia
surenzolyan@gmail.com

Abstract We consider the possibility to formalize the semantics of text through the apparatus of modal semantics, esp. using S. Kripke's notions of a model and model structure. As a demonstration of the abovementioned stands, we consider Pushkin's draft note "If I were the Tsar".   The draft note reflects this biographically motivated intention, but it can be reconsidered as a short story that explicates Pushkin's poetics on modality. Its incompleteness and multiplicity of final versions remind a post-modern technique of writing. One can find the same mechanism, though manifested in different ways, as it works in Pushkin's literary texts: transforming a character into an author and an author into a character and reader. The draft note is written on behalf of the Tsar; his author (Pushkin) turns out to be his character. But in a fictional world where Pushkin became a Tsar, another Pushkin remained a poet who talked about real episodes of his biography. These worlds did not differ significantly from each other - in both worlds, the Tsar punishes the poet for his statements. The fictional text and the actual world are represented as mutually permeable semantic areas, and their inter-penetrability determines a multivalued interpretation.

Keywords: Modal semantics, Alexander Pushkin, text semantics, Kripke's structure, truth in fiction.

Received 31/01/2022; accepted 15/04/2022.

> What can be described can happen too ...
>
> L. Wittgenstein, "Tractatus" 6.362.

0. Introduction

Narratives, Confabulations, and Conspiracies - the first relates to fiction, the second to psychiatry, medicine, and the third to politics. Of course, the modes of their representation also are different. Narratives are realized in texts, confabulations in the human mind, conspiracies in real life. The time they are guided by is also different – conspiracies are focused on creating the future, confabulations – on reformatting the

_____

_____

past, narratives create their own time of narration. However, they are all based on the possibility of textualization - to create possible worlds through texts. Without going into a debate about what Wittgenstein meant in the sentence given in the epigraph, the unified semantic basis of these three phenomena is apparent – this is modal semantics, a fundamental property of language that allows us to describe the world as it could be. The art and technique of narrative is the development of fundamental semantic linguistic competence, as Max Cresswell defined it:

> Since man can represent to himself the way, the world is he can represent to himself the way the world might be but isn't. So a formal theory of what is going on leads naturally to the postulation of entities which are these 'ways the world might be'; these are the possible worlds. Language then becomes a rule-governed device for putting into the mind of another a representation of the same set of possible worlds which is in the mind of the speaker. If this is so, then the notion of a possible world is at the heart of semantics and is even more basic than the notion of truth. (Cresswell 1988: 29).

However, this also requires the technique of textualization; thanks to it fictitious individuals acquire some type of reality (they can even be bought and sold – see: (Tze 2020). Wittgenstein, of course, had logical descriptions in mind, so he specifically stipulated: «What can be described can happen too: and what the law of causality is meant to exclude cannot even be described» (LPT.6. 362) .

Apart from the logic of causality, one can mention the logic of textuality. In social communication, pragma-semantic mechanisms are used to establish relations between heterogeneous worlds and connect events occurring in different worlds - events of the past and future, the worlds of the novel and the worlds of politics, etc. Meanwhile, there can be no causal connection between events in different possible worlds – for example, between an event in my dream and my assumed behavior a year later. However, it is possible that what is seen in a dream will be presented as a prediction. These textualization mechanisms can lead to situations where the semantics of narrative, confabulation and conspiracy may merge. Such a unique case is the great Russian poet and writer Alexander Pushkin's draft note «If I Were a Tsar» (usually it is represented as "Imaginary conversation with Alexander I." (Pushkin 1986: 110). This is an episode that can give a lot to modal semantics.. Different worlds are interconnected, a variety of intersections are possible between them. Logical causality gives way to rhetoric.

1.

This text is well known in Pushkin's studies, but only in the biographical aspect. It clearly reflects the relationship between the young Pushkin and the authorities (tsar Alexander) – as Pushkin himself perceived it. It also clarifies some episodes of Pushkin's southern exile. At the same time, it presents in a condensed form the principles of Pushkin's poetics, which were later embodied, first of all, in his prose works. It is a multi-form game of modalities that the actual and imaginary worlds are mutually permeable. As it has been already mentioned by the prominent researchers (Y. Tynjanov, A. Akhmatova, R. Jakobson, J. Lotman, S. Bocharov, M. Virolainen), in many works of Pushkin there are numerous cases of an interplay and intersection between his real biographical world and various fictional worlds of literary works. This is based on his general assumption: history is not exhausted by the actual course of events, and possible worlds also are worthy enough to acquire their existence through being

_____

represented as a text[2]. A borderline between fictional and the actual worlds is to be crossed in both directions: the real persons may become a literary character and vice versa. Even Pushkin himself - as the real biographical author – in his prosaic works usually yields his authorship to some fictional character (Belkin, Grinev, anonymous storytellers), and takes a position of an editor or publisher.

We suggest considering the system of such means as special poetics of modality. With such an approach, based on in-text analysis and comparison with other works of Pushkin, we may interpret this text not as a draft note but as a novella; the textual ambiguity of it is also an artistic device. The dynamics of the plot, usually created by inter-event connections, in this case is created by changes in modal relations of trans-world accessibility, the transition from one world to another (dream - reality), from one time to another (past – future), from one mental state and propositional attitude to another (to believe, imagine, read, remember, etc.).

The draft note was written when Pushkin was in his second exile, immediately after his first exile to the Caucasus (December 1824). Pushkin had been thinking about the possibility of meeting with Tsar to explain his innocence and receive an official pardon. Pushkin discusses this possibility in correspondence with friends. Naturally, he speculates about what to say to the Tsar and what the Tsar is supposed to say. The draft note reflects this biographically motivated intention, but then it is converted into a small novel; «If I were the Tsar, I would summon Alexander Pushkin and say to him: "Alexander Sergeyevich, you write excellent poetry. Alexander Pushkin would bow to me with a touch of embarrassed modesty, and I would continue…"». Pushkin provided necessary explanations during this conversation and demonstrated his respect for His Majesty and his generosity, and Alexander intended to forgive the poet. But this final note was cross out - instead, and the opposite version was created: «But here Pushkin would have flaked up and would have blurted out a whole lot of unnecessary remarks, and I would have banished him to Siberia when he would be written a poem called "Yermak" or "Kuchum ."» (Pushkin 1986: 110)

Thus, even if Pushkin were the Tsar, he (Who - ?) did not reconcile with the poet. The conflict between the poet and monarch was inevitable and non-resolvable. The only difference between this fictional and the actual world was that Pushkin would be sent to Siberia (instead of the Caucasus) and would write a poem not on the Caucasian (as he actually did), but not on Siberian themes. However, the fictional conversation became the actual prediction. The history makes an unexpectable move («What can be described can happen too»). Immediately after Pushkin's record, Alexander I died of an unexpected illness in November 1825. Then the Decembrist Revolt took place in Russia on 26 December 1825, during the interregnum following the sudden death of Alexander I. Alexander's heir apparent, Constantine, had declined the succession, and his younger brother Nicholas decided to take power as Emperor Nicholas I. While some of the army had sworn loyalty to Nicholas, a force of about 3,000 troops tried to mount a military coup, as a formal pretext, stating their loyalty in favour of Constantine. Actually, the uprising was prepared for a long time, under Alexander, and Pushkin took part in the early meetings of the "Green Lamp" association (it was a a clandestine literary branch of a secret society, the Union of Welfare). Probably, being in exile saved Pushkin - according to him, he would have joined the uprising. After the arrest of the rebels, Pushkin was in uncertainty, his further fate depended on the course of the

_____

[2] Cf.: «People believe only in fame and do not understand that there might be among them some Napoleon, who has never commanded a single company of chasseurs, or another Descartes, who has not published a single line in the Moscow Telegraph" (Pushkin 2016: 235).

_____

investigation and the testimony of his friends. In the autumn of 1826 the new Tsar sent gendarmes in order to convoy Pushkin for a personal conversation[3]. Both options of his draft-note may occur – an exile to Syberia or an official pardon. Paradoxically, in some sense both of these alternatives were actualised: Pushkin was forgiven for his previous verses, he was allowed to come back to capitals, but at the same time, all his writings ought to be censored by the Tsar personally. The crossed-out text became a real case. Draft acts as an analog of hypertext.

2.

One can found the same mechanism, though manifested in different ways, as it works in Pushkin's literary texts: transforming a character into an author and an author into a character and reader. The draft note is written on behalf of the Tsar; his author (Pushkin) turns out to be his character. But in a fictional world where Pushkin became a Tsar, another Pushkin remained a poet who talked about actual episodes of his biography, and these worlds did not differ significantly from each other - in both worlds, the Tsar punishes the poet for his statements. The fictitious text and the actual world are represented as mutually permeable semantic domains. This draft note can be reconsidered as a short story that explicates Pushkin's poetics on modality. Its incompleteness and multiplicity of final versions remind a post-modern technique of writing.

At the same time, the double "I" of the text ("I-Pushkin" and "I-Pushkin-Tsar") leads to a double centering of the worlds of the text[4], which makes it impossible to determine who the speaker is, why the statements are subject to multidimensional interpretation. Pushkin is a narrator, from the second sentence loses his "I", the narrator becomes Pushkin- who has become a tsar, who punishes poet Pushkin's (Pushkin, who remained Pushkin). The two-dimensional structure of the record turns out to be insufficient - the draft with its many variants represents one of the most challenging cases of deciphering Pushkin's drafts (see Bondi 1952, and at the same time, the form of the draft, in which crossed out and restored fragments, can be considered as possible scenarios for the development of events (the Tsar forgives Pushkin), given against the background of a kind of oxymoron: "counterfactual, but relevant-in-text" - the world in which the Tsar exiles Pushkin to Siberia, – such notation creates an opportunity to overcome the linearity of writing and present a multidimensional structure of the described event).

An adequate description of the semantics of the text can be precisely the model structure - a system of mutually penetrable (accessible) worlds (the real world, the imaginary counterfactual world, the world in the future, and even the world of "Boris Godunov", since the passage is written in the same notebook as the draft of the tragedy, it is both intext and intertext). They are not significant in themselves, but their correlation within the system of texts and worlds.

_____

[3] Cf.: «After the suppression of the Decembrist uprising of 1825, the new tsar Nicholas I, aware of Pushkin's immense popularity and knowing that he had taken no part in the Decembrist "conspiracy," allowed him to return to Moscow in the autumn of 1826. During a long conversation between them, the tsar met the poet's complaints about censorship with a promise that in the future he himself would be Pushkin's censor he collapse of the rising had been a grievous experience for Pushkin, whose heart was wholly with the "guilty" Decembrists, five of whom had been executed, while others were exiled to forced labour in Siberia». - BRITANNICA https://www.britannica.com/biography/Aleksandr-Sergeyevich-Pushkin/Return-from-exile (accesed: 30/01/2021)

[4] «A possible world is like a map, and a centered world is like a map with an arrow pointing to a spot saying "you are here"» (Lewis 1979: 520).

_____

3.

Imagining a meeting with the Tsar, Pushkin at the same time writes his great historical drama, *Boris Godunov* (The original name is a stylization on a medieval drama: *Comedy about Tsar Boris and Grishka Otrepiev*) The actual meeting between the Tsar and the poet took place in the Chudov Monastery - this is an ancient monastery that stood in the very center of the Kremlin (it was destroyed in 1929). The drama "Boris Godunov" also began with a scene in the Chudov Monastery - here the monk of this monastery, Grigory Otrepyev, decides to become an impostor, take the name of the murdered Tsarevich Dmitry and declare war on Tsar Boris. Perhaps because of his directness, Pushkin removed this passage from the final text.

Drafts of it are contained in the same notebook as the passage «If I Were a tsar». Pushkin transfers his conflict with Tsar Alexander to the past. There, in the imaginary world, the real relationship between the poet and the Tsar could be expressed in a more direct form. Pushkin's supposed attitude of the Tsar towards himself can be found in the following remark by Tsar Boris:

> How I hate this rebel clan of Pushkins; (Pushkin 2006: p. 335).

Tsar Boris-in-the-tragedy had reason to think so: Pushkin's attitude to the Tsar was clearly expressed. Alexander Pushkin realized his imaginary rebellion in «Boris Godunov» - Pushkin made his forefathers, both nobles of Pushkin clan are active participants in the conspiracy against Tsar Boris. In this, he relied on the information known to him about the Pushkin family[5]. One of his ancestors, Gavrila Grigorevich Pushkin (d. 1638) was a prominent figure during the Time of Troubles. It is a historical fact that

> On June 1, 1605, Gavrila Pushkin boldly entered Moscow to read Dmitry's proclamation to the city's anxious population. Pushkin was accompanied by many Russians from the capital's suburbs and encountered no resistance from Godunov supporters as he made his way to Red Square. There thousands of Muscovites gathered to hear Pushkin speak, and the crowd proved to be far from hostile to Dmitry's courier. Previous couriers sent to Moscow by Dmitry had been killed or imprisoned… Pushkin accurately paraphrases the Pretender Dmitry's conciliatory proclamation that Gavrila Pushkin read aloud to the assembled people on Red Square. (Dunning et al: 475; 508)

The other Pushkin (Afanasy Mikhailovich Pushkin) is an invented character,. However, it has been claimed that

> Afanasy was modeled after Evstafy Mikhailovich Pushkin, who served at court for twenty-five years before being promoted into the boyar council (or duma) in 1598. But Evstafy Pushkin had already been disgraced by Tsar Boris and sent into Siberian exile in 1601. His brother Ivan M. Pushkin replaced him on the boyar council and may actually have been the prototype for Afanasy Pushkin. – (Dunning et al.: 474).

At the same time, Alexander Pushkin makes his ancestor Gavrila Pushkin a witness to some ideal interaction and concord between the poet and the authorities (the historical Gavrila Pushkin joined the Pretender already in Russia):

_____

[5] «Pushkin did not invent or exaggerate his family's historical rebelliousness or the multiple Siberian exiles associated with that spirit. Those papers also provide intriguing clues about the interesting, itinerant, and politically active Pushkins who lived during the Time of Troubles» (Dunning 2006: xvii).

_____

> *Poet*
> (giving him a page of manuscript)
> Your favor in accepting
> This meager fruit of dedicated toil.
> *Pretender*
> What have we here? Verses in Latin script!
> Sacred a hundredfold the laureled union
> Of sword and lyre.
> *Khrushchov* (in a low voice to Pushkin)
> Who's that?
> *Pushkin*
> A bard.
> *Khrushchov*
> What's that?
> *Pushkin*
> How shall I say?
> In Russian – scribbler of verses, or a minstrel.
> *Pretender*
> Excellent verses! I believe in bards' prophecies.
> Not in vain does passion burn
> Within their fiery breasts: blest is the deed
> That, in foretelling, they have glorified!
> Come here, my friend. Accept this gift in memory of me.
> (Pushkin 2006: 355)

4.

Attempts to apply the apparatus of the possible world semantics to the analysis of a literary text have been undertaken repeatedly - mainly in connection with the problem of Truth in Fiction and modes of reference to fictional objects. Meanwhile, this can be done from a broader perspective: to describe a semantic structure of a text as a peculiar modal system (Zolyan 2013). The semantics of a sentence may be represented as a set of the possible worlds in which it is true. In order for a text to be composed of these sentences, it is necessary to establish certain relationships between the worlds of different segments.. Thus linkages between sentences in the text can be described as a set of various relations of transition from one set of possible worlds to another. Relationships between sentences are formalized through text operators that relate one set of worlds to another set accessible from it. From a linguistic point of view, these operators may be assumed as means of cohesion and coherence between segments of a text and at the same time, from a logical point of view, as a relationship of trans-world accessibility and compatibility[6].

In addition to this, it is also required that individuals of those worlds would be comparable with each other. The simplest (or even prototypical) relationship of identity will be the following. All individuals (objects, things) described in different states of affairs are the same and belongs to the same domain D of interpretation, "D can be anything we want to talk about" (Creswell 1994: 43); In this case linguistic means of

---

[6] Textual operators are considered as all possible forms of links between sentences and situations that represent various relations of accessibility between worlds. These operators can be logical or quasi-logical –"and"; "if…then"… or else the narrative correlates of the latter ones, e.g. "owing to," "as a result of"; purely narrative, e.g. "before…. afterward", "in the meantime." These links can also be reduced to strictly syntactic ones and can be given by a list of possible conjunctions and connectives between sentences or complex textual segments.

_____

naming ensure the identity of individuals in different states of affairs. Since logical-semantic connectors do not affect on modal relations, linear organization of a text leads to modal homogeneity, and names act as rigid designators: in all sentences (or worlds) the same names (or their synonymic or anaphoric substitutes) refer to the same individuals (or objects). In linguistic terms, this relation can be considered as a cohesion: different worlds are not only the result of some modal transformation, but they are also connected by the fact that the same individuals and objects are assigned to them. However, cohesion can also be based on other ontological assumptions, and in this case, one should turn not to the theory of rigid designators S. Kripke (1980), but to their alternatives. In these theories, cohesion will be provided not by naming but based on predicates and attributes describing properties and relations that characterize an individual in a particular world (Hintikka 1972). Besides, it can also be assumed that the same names may refer to "twins" - individuals from different worlds may be similar but not identical. They are related to each other as counterpart individuals affiliated only to the world where they are described. This conception (Lewis 1968, 1986) may be more convenient for describing a counterfactual state of affairs. In such cases, names cease to act as rigid designators, and linguistic means will exploit the difference between figurative and literal naming, semantic reference and the speaker's reference, and other cases based on the ambiguity of the linguistic sign. As a compromise between different options, one may select the doctrine of transmundalism:

> Transmundalism as such has nothing to say about what can be in D… Ordinary concrete individual is a function from world to sets of space-time points, each such set being the "manifestation" of that individual in that world. Nothing at all has been said about whether the member of D is understood to be only an actual individual or to allow merely possible individuals (Cresswell 1994: 43-44).

4.1.

There are two possible principal ways to represent a text: a) as a linear sequence of sentences; b) as an integral unity; accordingly, a text is understood as a holistic, multidimensional macro-structure. Both of these understandings reflect various aspects of text generation and processing. The basic concepts of trans-world accessibility and compatibility allow unifying these aspects of a textual organization as a two-level description.   The transfiguration of linear text into a multidimensional structure (or non-linear composition) presupposes that logical-semantic linkages are complicated by modal ones (a story in a story, worlds of intentions, desires, deontic, imagined, etc.). Multidimensional interpretation of a sentence in different worlds with different ontologies (i.e., the actual world, fictional worlds, counterfactual worlds, etc.) causes permanent changes of its truth conditions and reference.

One may consider the possibility to formalize the semantics of text through the apparatus of modal semantics, esp. using S. Kripke's notions of a model and model structure (Kripke 1963). The model structure is a set of worlds interrelated by certain relations of accessibility. In other words, this model structure is a particular world with given relations of transition to other worlds. In general, this comes to validate a capacity of a text to be interpreted upon the stratified domain of reference: an ordered set of possible worlds differing by their logical and ontological characteristics. Another Kripke's concept is a model: i.e., the binary function f (E, W) attributed upon the model structure. This function assigns to each sentence E its truth-value in respect to the world Wn from the set {W}. This can be considered a way to determine whether or not a particular proposition corresponds to some state of affairs in the particular worlds of a

_____

text. Versus the case of an isolated sentence, the proposition is thus valued not within the indefinite universe of worlds but within an already determined model structure, that is, within the worlds included in the set of worlds forming by the text meaning according to the definition mentioned above. Thus it becomes possible to describe to what states of affairs (possible worlds) are possible regarding the given text. For instance, in what respect the worlds of some set of sentences are accessible from the other sets. A model structure determines interrelations between worlds, whereas the model itself ascribes the truth value of a separate proposition within one of the worlds of the given set.

Another typological distinction can be drawn based on the notion of "a centered word" between 1) monocentric texts with some single "centered word," and its textual domain of individuals and contextual characteristics are primary for all other textual worlds, and 2) pluricentric texts which are organized as a system of words with multiple centres. In some respect, this distinction may correlate with a distinction between textual and hypertextual structuring. In monocentric texts all semantic operations are oriented on the same timeline, but in pluricentric texts there may be presumed existence of different time-space lines and time-space points for the manifestation of individuals from different textual domains.

5. Conclusion: coming back to Pushkin, or toward a linguistic version of (neo-) Wittgensteinian semantics

At one time, considering the question of the truth in fiction, Frege decided that this criterion does not apply to it in logical semantics already; in the 70s -80s, the problem of truth in fiction receives solutions - by its modal extension. The tendency to consider fiction as a special form of narrative has prevailed, and this is indisputable; and that the reference of such narratives can only be made to the worlds of fiction. Searle suggested that literary texts should be regarded as non-serious but pretending to be such speech acts. The narrator does not deceive – he indicates through various linguistic and extralinguistic markers that he is carrying out a pretended speech act (Searle 1975). David Lewis proposed another solution. Truth conditions are established concerning the world in which the narrator is located: A sentence of the form "In fiction F, φ" is non-vacuously true if and only if some world where F is told as known fact and φ is true differs less from our actual world, on balance, than does any world where F is told as known fact and φ is not true. (Lewis 1978) As one can see, the narrator is placed in the world of the text, where, by the way, he can lie. Truth in fiction is the product of two sources: "the explicit content of the fiction, and a background consisting either of the facts about our world or of the beliefs overt in the community of origin." (Lewis, 1978, p.44). These are the worlds that are narrated (i.e., fictional worlds), but not the worlds in which this text is narrated (i.e., actual worlds).

These two approaches became dominant. Follow-up studies concretized and or combined their main points. Thus, one of the latest influential works (Predelli 2020), based on the abovementioned approaches , puts forward the conception of radical fictionalism. In this version, the fiction worlds have no referential intersections with the actual world.

Meanwhile, as could be seen, another logic and semantics operate in Pushkin's worlds. Following the abovementioned approaches, the semantics of Pushkin's draft can be considered only in relation to the worlds of Pushkin's imagination, but not to the actual world of the poet Pushkin and Tsar Alexander. Let's also point to two boyars of Pushkin - one, Gavril Pushkin will have to be described as a "real" to whom some non-real predicates assigned (he did not meet with the Pretender in Poland), and the other,

_____

invented by Pushkin Athanasius, as a fictional character (then the question is how this fictional character meets in the tragedy with the future Tsar Vasily Shuisky). As for the draft under consideration, the confusion with Pushkin-the- Tsar, Pushkin- the poet, and Pushkin- exiled-to Siberia, Pushkin-the author of the passage is insurmountable. Does it make sense to distinguish between their status and attribute different rules of reference to them, considering Gavrila Pushkin a historical character and Athanasius - the fruit of Pushkin's reintroduction. Both of them refer to Alexander Pushkin's historically existing ancestors and function as a vehicle to transpose him from the 19-th century to the Times of Troubles. For an adequate semantic theory, it will be essential not to be a rigid attachment of individuals to a particular world – but the possibility of their traceability through various worlds. Radical fictionalism can be contrasted with moderate transmundalism - in our interpretation, it assumes the existence of individuals who differ in characteristics in different worlds (various Pushkins). Still, at the same time, it assumes the presence of interpretational rules for their transformation from world to world. The transition from world to world demonstrates what the individual would have been in a different course of events. - Who would Pushkin be if he were a tsar, what would Pushkin write in Siberia, etc. The fictional text and the actual world are represented as mutually interconnected semantic areas, and their inter-penetrability determines a multivalued interpretation. To describe such a situation, it is proposed to use, on the one hand, the apparatus of cognitive linguistics, primarily the concept of blending (this possibility has been left out of our consideration) , and on the other - the semantics of possible worlds, in the classic interpretation that was given to S. Kripke - as a set of mutually compatible worlds connected through some relations and designators

Coming back to Wittgenstein, Pushkin's attitude toward actual and possible can be compared with the initial statements from the "Tractatus":

> 1 The world is all that is the case.
> 1.1 The world is the totality of facts, not of things.
> 1.11 The world is determined by the facts, and by their being all the facts. - TLP

Language and Poetry provides another perspective:
That is the case what is may be described.
The world is the totality of texts, not of things
What can be described can happen too.
The world is determined by texts, and by their being all the facts represented through texts. Non-recorded events ceased to exist.

Blest is the deed
That, in foretelling, they have glorified!

_____

References

Bondi, Sergej (1952), «Original text and political content of "Imaginary Conversation with Alexander I"», in A.M. Egolin, (ed*). Pushkin. Lermontov. Gogol'* [Pushkin. Lermontov. Gogol]. Moscow: AN SSSR Publ. pp. 167—194 (in Russ.).

Cresswell, Maxwell (1994), *Language in the World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Dunning, Chester (ed.) (2006), *The uncensored Boris Godunov : the case for Pushkin's original comedy, . with annotated text and translation,* by Chester Dunning with Caryl Emerson, Sergei Fomichev, Lidiia Lotman, and Antony Wood. The Wisconsin Center for Pushkin Studies. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Dunning, Chester, Lotman, Lidiia and Wood, Antony (2006), *Notes to Pushkin's Comedy.* in Dunning, (ed.) 2006, pp. 454 – 510.

Hintikka, Jaako (1972), «The Semantics of Modal Notions and the Indeterminacy of Ontology», in Davidson D., Harman G. (eds.) *Semantics of Natural Language. Synthese*, vol. 40, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 408 – 424.

Kripke, Saul (1980), *Naming and Necessity*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge: MA.

Kripke, Saul (1963), «Semantical Analysis of Modal Logic I Normal Modal Propositional Calculi*», in Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, v. 9, pp. 67-96,

Lewis, David (1968), «Counterpart Theory and Quantified Modal Logic», in *Journal of Philosophy* 65, pp 113–26.

Lewis, David (1978), «Truth in fiction» in *American Philosophical Quarterly.*, 1978, 15(1), 37–46.

Lewis, David (1979), «Attitudes De Dicto and De Se», in *Philosophical Review*, 88: pp. 513–543.

Lewis, David (1986), *On the Plurality of Worlds*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Predelli, Stefano (2020), *Fictional Discourse: A Radical Fictionalist Semantics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Pushkin, Alexander. S. (1986), *On literature*, selected, edited and translated by Tatiana Wolf, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Illinois.

_____

Pushkin, Alexander (2006), *Comedy about Tsar Boris and Grishka Otrepiev,* translated by Antony Wood. – in: Dunning, (ed.), pp. 247 – 452.

Pushkin, Alexander (2016), *Novels, Tales, Journeys: The Complete Prose of Alexander Pushkin*, Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (Translators) Penguin Classics.

Searle, John (1975) «The Logical Status of Fictional Discourse», in *New Literary History* 1975, 6: pp. 319–32.

TLP – Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1922) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus ,* Kegan Paul, London.

Tze Ping Lim, (2020), Beyond Copyright: Applying a Radical Idea--Expression Dichotomy to the Ownership of Fictional Characters, *21 Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law*, 95 – 144

Zolyan, Suren. (2013), "Beskonechnyy labirint stsepleniy": semantika teksta kak mnogomernaya struktura. "Endless labyrinth of linkages": text semantics as a multidimensional structure. *Kritika i semiotika* [Criticism and semiotics], 1 (18), pp. 18—44 (in Russ.)